DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 148 242 HE 009 503

AUTHOR	Jacobs, Frederic; Tingley, Tyler
TITLE	The Evolution of Eligibility Criteria for Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965: Appendix A. The Development of Institutions of Higher Education: Theory and Assessment of Impact of Four Possible Areas of Federal Intervention.
INSTITUTION	Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass. Graduate School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation.
PUB DATE	[77]
CONTRACT	300-75-0221
NOTE	66p.; For related documents see HE 009 500-505; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document
AVAILABLE FROM	USOE-OPBE, Room 4087, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202, or Harvard Graduate School of Education, c/o George B. Weathersby, 450 Gutman Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138 ($2.50)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Accreditation (Institutions); Administrative Policy; Bibliographies; *Black Colleges; College Planning; Educational Improvement; Educational Legislation; *Equal Education; *Federal Aid; Federal Legislation; Financial Support; *Government School Relationship; Higher Education; *Historical Reviews; Organizational Development; Statistical Data
IDENTIFIERS	*Developing Institutions; *Eligibility; *Higher Education Act Title III; Institutional Characteristics

ABSTRACT

Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 has become the largest direct institutional-aid program for colleges and universities in the federal budget. Its legislative history is traced in this report along with the evolution of criteria for eligibility and award of these funds. Cited are the debates about the program, which was originally intended primarily to help struggling black colleges enter the "academic mainstream" but which has evolved into a loosely defined program designed to help all types of "struggling" or "developing" colleges and universities. The years of debate about the definitions of "developing institutions" and the evolving eligibility of debate about the definitions of "developing institutions' and the evolving eligibility criteria are reviewed. A three-page bibliography is included. (Author/LBH)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED148242

HE

The Evolution of Eligibility Criteria for Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965

Frederic Jacobs
Tyler Tingley

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix A

The Development of Institutions of Higher Education: Theory and Assessment of Impact of Four Possible Areas of Federal Intervention

HE009503

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

This study of the development of colleges and universities was undertaken for the United States Office of Education, Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation under contract number 300-75-0221. The project was conducted by a research team from the Harvard Graduate School of Education under the direction of George B. Weathersby. The purposes of the study were to use a merged machine-readable data base and relevant historical documents, to identify the institutional effects of funds from Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Reports prepared under this contract are listed below and copies may be obtained from the USOE-OPBE (Room 4087, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202) or the Harvard Graduate School of Education (c/o George B. Weathersby, #450 Gutman Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138). Please include a check for the indicated amounts for orders from Harvard.

The research team consisted of Frederic Jacobs, Gregory A. Jackson, Edward P. St. John, Tyler Tingley, and George B. Weathersby. Research assistance was provided by Joan Gallos and William Trueheart. Also, we extend special thanks to our consultants, Daryl E. Carlson, James Farmer, and Wayne Kirschling, and to our secretary, Mary Sanderson.

Final Report

"The Development of Institutions of Higher Education: Theory and Assessment of Impact of Four Possible Areas of Federal Intervention" (62 pages, $2.50)

Appendices

A. Legislative History of Title III

"The Evolution of Eligibility Criteria for Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965" by Frederic Jacobs and Tyler Tingley (61 pages, $2.50)

B. Theories and Measures of Institutional Development and Review of Previous Studies

"Institutional Development In Higher Education: A Conceptual Framework For Evaluation" by Edward P. St. John and George B. Weathersby (51 pages, $2.25)

C. Descriptive Analysis of Institutional Change

"Descriptive Analysis of Institutional Change Using HEGIS, CFAE, and Title III Data Bases" by Edward P. St. John, Tyler Tingley, and Joan Gallos (94 pages, $3.50)

D. Review of Cost and Efficiency Research

"A Review of Production Function Estimation for Higher Education Institutions", by Daryl E. Carlson (122 pages, $4.25)

E. Financial Aid and Student Enrollment

"Financial Aid and Student Enrollment" by Gregory A. Jackson (30 pages, $1.50)

F. Description of Merged Data Base

"Description of Merged Data Base" by Gregory A. Jackson (3 pages, $ .50)

G. Production Function Analysis

"Production Function Analysis in Higher Education: General Methodology and Application to Four Year Black Colleges" by William Trueheart (50 pages, $2.25)

The Evolution of Eligibility Criteria For Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965

Abstract

Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, one of many Great Society programs enacted during the Johnson administration, has become the largest direct, institutional-aid program for colleges and universities in the federal budget. In this paper, Frederic Jacobs and Tyler Tingley document the legislative history and the evolution of criteria for eligibility and award of these funds. They cite the debates about the program which was originally intended primarily to help struggling Black colleges enter the "academic mainstream" but which has evolved into a loosly defined program designed to help all types of "struggling" or "developing" colleges and universities. The authors trace the years of debate about the definitions of "developing institutions" and the evolving eligibility criteria for the program.

Table of Contents

	Page
The Evolution of Eligibility Criterion for Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965	1
The Need for Cooperative Arrangements	13
Whether or Not to Include Junior or Community Colleges	22
The Need or an Effective Advisory Council	29
The Lack of Specificity in Defining "Developing Institutions" and in Articulating Objectives and Goals for These Introductions	33
The Emphasis on a National Teaching Fellowship Program	37
Bibliography	59

Tables

Table 1:	Accreditation Status of 2,168 Institutions of Higher Education by Control and Type, December 31, 1964	3
Table 2:	Strengthening Developing Materials (supporting materials presented by Francis Keppel)	32
Table 3:	Characteristics of Funded Developing Institutions (1967)	45
Table 4:	Quantitative Measures of Institutional Eligibility (1971)	49
Table 5:	Title III Eligibility Criteria	50
Table 6:	Criteria Adopted for Fiscal 1976	52
Table 7:	Application and Appropriation Under Title III (1966 - 1974)	56
Table 8:	Characteristics Having a Statistically Significant Input on Eligibility and Funding (1973 - 1974)	57

(House hearings p. 38). Francis Keppel, Commissioner of Education, reiterated Celebreeze's assertion of "ten percent unaccredited." The documentation submitted in testimony at the request of Congressman Green, however, revealed that the percentage of unaccredited institutions was twice as great as Celebreeze, Keppel and President Johnson had stated.

The material submitted was as shown in Table 1.

Title III, the section of the Higher Education Act of 1965 devoted to "developing institutions," represented a significant commitment by the federal government to assist those colleges "which have the desire and potential to make a substantial contribution to the higher education resources of our Nation but which for financial and other reasons are struggling for survival and are isolated from the main currents of academic life..." (House Hearings p. 10).

The history of events in the United States leading to passage of the Act have been reported in detail elsewhere (Howard, 1967), as has been the development of higher education institutions for Blacks (Carnegie Commission, 1971, Bowles and DeCosta, 1971). Since its passage, there have been two comprehensive studies of Title III (Miller, Gurin and Clarke, (1970); Hodgkinson and Schenkel (1974).

This report deals with the evolution of the legislation, the objectives for the developing institutions articulated by proponents of the legislation, and the criteria for identifying eligible institutions.

A seminal document in drafting the legislation was a report, The Predominantly Negro Colleges and Universities in Transition, written in 1964 by Earl J. McGrath, Executive Officer of the Institute of Higher

Table 1

Accreditation status of 2,168 institutions of higher education, by control and type, Dec. 31, 1964[1]

Control	Number of Institutions	Accredited		Unaccredited	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	2,168	1,711	78.9	457	21.1
Public	783	600	76.6	183	23.4
Private	1,385	1,111	80.2	274	19.8
	I[2]				
Total	653	391	59.9	262	40.1
Public	395	227	57.5	168	42.5
Private	258	164	63.6	94	36.4
	II				
Total	804	653	81.2	151	18.8
Public	101	89	88.1	12	11.9
Private	703	564	80.2	139	19.8
	III				
Total	465	445	95.7	20	4.3
Public	177	176	99.4	1	.6
Private	288	269	93.4	19	6.6
	IV				
Total	223	216	96.8	7	3.2
Public	106	106	100.0	0	0.0
Private	117	110	94.0	7	6.0
	V				
Total	23	6	26.1	17	73.9
Public	4	2	50.0	2	50.0
Private	19	4	21.1	15	78.9

[1] These are the 2,168 education institutions currently listed in the U.S. Office of Education "Directory: Part 3, Higher Education." It is estimated that in addition to the institutions listed, there are about 200 other institutions. A list of organizations designated by the Commissioner of Education as nationally recognized accrediting agencies and associations follows.

[2] Groups I - V include institutions as follows: (cont. on next page)

Table 1 (cont.)

Organizations Designated by the Commissioner of Education as Nationally Recognized Accrediting Agencies and Associations

I. Regional

Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools
New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools
North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools
Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

II. Professional

American Association of Nurse Anesthetists
National Architectural Accrediting Board
Accrediting Association of Bible Colleges
Accrediting Commission for Business Schools
The American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business
American Chemical Society, Committee on Professional Training
American Dental Association, Council on Dental Education
Engineers' Council for Professional Development
Society of American Foresters
American Council on Education for Journalism
American Bar Association, Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar
American Library Association, Committee on Accreditation
Liaison Committee on Medical Education
Council on Medical Education and Hospitals of the American Medical Association
National Association of Schools of Music
National League for Nursing, Inc.
American Optometric Association, Council on Optometric Education
American Osteopathic Association
American Council on Pharmaceutical Education
American Podiatry Association
The American Public Health Association, Inc.
American Association of Schools of Religious Education
Council on Social Work Education
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
The American Association of Theological Schools
American Veterinary Medical Association, Council on Education

III. Other

National Home Study Council
New York Board of Regents (for higher institutions within New York State)

(House hearings, pp. 117-119).

(footnote cont. from previous page)

I. 2 but less than 4 years of work beyond the 12th grade.
II. Only the bachelor's and/or 1st professional degree.
III. Master's and/or 2nd professional degree.
IV. Doctor of philosophy and equivalent degrees.
V. Other.

Education at Teachers College, Columbia University. McGrath's work, funded by the Carnegie Corporation, was a study of 123 predominantly Negro colleges and universities. His recommendations formed the basis of much of the legislation proposed in Title III: he was an advocate of major federal responsibility for "strengthening the predominantly Negro colleges and universities" and of broadly based institutional support and interinstitutional cooperation. The following is a summary of his recommendations:

1. Maintain and strengthen most existing institutions -- None of the predominantly Negro colleges should be allowed to die until their present and prospective students can be fully assured of better educational opportunities elsewhere. Even the limited and inefficient programs of weaker institutions should be maintained while rigorous efforts are being made to strengthen them.

2. Institutional cooperation -- Among themselves and with other institutions, the predominantly Negro colleges and universities must find ways for greater sharing of resources, for participation in State and regionwide projects, and (in some cases) for merger or at least a sharing of facilities.

3. Long-range planning -- A center should be established in at least one of the great universities to assist these colleges in forecasting their own potential roles and to plan their services in terms of their own resources and the services available elsewhere. Outside help is needed in making long-range plans for organizing and enriching their curriculums, for recruiting and utilizing their faculties, for making maximum use of space and facilities, for designing and erecting new buildings, and for long-range campus and financial development.

4. Strengthening administrative leadership -- Foundations should provide the means to permit individuals now in presidential and deanship posts, and promising faculty members as well, to take leave for periods of continuing education and professional training.

5. Faculty development -- These institutions must attach a high priority to the continuing development of their teaching effectiveness, and, as appropriate, outside financial personnel resources need to be made available to assist them. Urgent attention must be devoted to increasing faculty salaries, as well as to pro-

visions for advanced study, leave, relief from nonacademic burdens, and professional contacts.

6. Curriculum -- A most pressing need is for the strengthening of instruction in the liberal arts disciplines, better to prepare graduates for graduate and professional opportunities. Many presently taught vocational subjects should be dropped, and others need to be added that lead to opening careers in business, industry and government. The social and natural sciences are particularly appropriate for further development at this time.

7. Miscellaneous recommendations -- Most of the colleges should not materially raise their standards for admission; rather, widespread support should be given to improve the scholastic qualifications of prospective students during their high school years and in special summer programs just before they enroll in college. Tuition fees must be kept at the lowest possible level consistent with educational standards; student financial aid opportunities must constantly be augmented. The present dominant use of lectures, recitations, and assigned readings in textbooks in the program of instruction must be diversified to include also seminars, independent study, informal reading, and community action programs. Efforts to enhance the on-campus living experience, to increase library facility and usage, and to professionalize and extend counseling services are also needed. Exchange of students with other colleges is endorsed.

8. Sources of financial support -- The various proposals listed above involve the expenditure of huge additional funds. These must come from a wide variety of sources, and must be just as widely diffused. In fact, a mere dozen or so of the institutions in the United Negro College Fund have been, until now, the principal beneficiaries of foundation philanthropy. Aid must be extended to a much larger spread of institutions, to the reasonably good as well as to the superior; even modest support to a less well-known institution can significantly increase educational opportunities for thousands of Negro students.

But an effort to provide the financial means for expanding educational opportunities, since it will run into the hundreds of millions of dollars, is beyond the means of States and private donors alone. The Federal Governmnet, therefore, must assume a major and inescapable role in strengthening the predominantly Negro colleges and universities.

(Senate hearings, p. 393).

The legislation related to developing institutions was proposed by President Lyndon B. Johnson on 12 January 1965. The entire text of his message relating to assistance for smaller colleges is as follows:

> I recommend that legislation be enacted to strengthen less developed colleges.
>
> Many of our smaller colleges are battling for survival. About 10 percent lack proper accreditation, and others face constantly the threat of losing accreditation. Many are isolated from the main currents of academic life.
>
> Private sources and States alone cannot carry the whole burden of doing what must be done for these important units in our total educational systems. Federal aid is essential.
>
> Universities should be encouraged to enter into cooperative relationships to help less developed colleges, including such assistance as --
>
> A program of faculty exchanges
>
> Special programs to enable faculty members of small colleges to renew and extend knowledge of their fields.
>
> A national fellowship program to encourage highly qualified young graduate students and instructors in large universities to augment the teaching resources of small colleges.
>
> The development of joint programs to make more efficient use of available facilities and faculty.
>
> In union there is strength. This is the basic premise of my recommendation (Education Goals, pp. 8-9)

At the request of the President, Senator Wayne Morse submitted to the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and Representative Adam C. Powell submitted to the Committee on Education and Labor bills for consideration of a wide variety of programs to aid students and institutions, including provisions to raise the academic qualify of financially marginal small colleges. The provision finally adopted (Title III) differed from the Administration's bill in three major ways: it was authorized for one year rather than three, it made eligible junior and community colleges, and it authorized $55 million rather than the

$30 million requested.

After extensive hearings, the bill was passed on 20 October 1965 and signed into law 8 November, extending new responsibilities to the federal government in higher education, including providing undergraduate scholarships for the first time, insuring student loans, subsidizing interest on those loans, aiding libraries, providing for classroom construction and the purchase of instructional equipment, assisting in community service education projects, and establishing a program to improve teaching quality (the Teacher Corps). In addition, Title III, "Strengthening Developing Institutions," was part of the enacted bill. The following is a summary by the Congressional Quarterly Almanac (1965):

> Authorized $55 million in fiscal 1966 to raise the academic quality of developing institutions (colleges which "are struggling for survival and are isolated from the main currents of academic life").
>
> Allocated 78 percent of the appropriation to colleges that award B.A. degrees and 22 percent to two year institutions, including those that provide a semi-professional education of technicians in engineering, mathematical and scientific fields.
>
> Waived accreditation requirements for schools that accept only high school graduates, are making "reasonable progress toward accreditation" and have been in existence for five years.
>
> Authorized grants to developing institutions and other colleges or businesses for cooperative programs to strengthen the developing colleges' academic programs and administration including the exchange of faculty or students, fellowships, work-study programs and joint use of libraries and laboratories.
>
> Authorized "national teaching fellowships" to graduate students and junior faculty members who, at the request of a developing institution, would teach there for up to two years. Permitted a stipend of up to $6500 for each fellowship, plus $400 for each dependent.
>
> Directed the Commissioner to establish an Advisory Council on Developing Institutions to help him identify institutions qualifying for federal aid. (p. 295).

One of the notable characteristics of the legislation in general and of Title III specifically was that "the 89th Congress continued a trend started in 1964 to make federal college aid available on a broad basis and avoid limitations on the use of funds" (p. 294). Title III, as proposed in its Senate version (which did not differ substantially from the House version), contained the following sections:

Section 301:

Subsection (a) states that the purpose of Title III is to improve the quality of colleges which "are struggling to survive and are isolated from the main currents of academic life."

Subsection (b) authorizes $55 million for fiscal year 1966, and $60 million for each of the succeeding four years.

Section 302.

Defines the term "developing institution."

Section 303.

Subsection (a) establishes an Advisory Council, chaired by the Commissioner.

Subsection (b) provides for advice from the Council to the Commissioner in administering Title III, and "in the establishment of priorities to be used in approving applications under title III."

Subsection (c) provides for compensation to Council members.

Section 304.

Subsection (a) provides for grants to developing institutions "as well as to other Colleges and universities" to carry out cooperative arrangements "which promise to be effective as measures for strengthening the academic programs and the administration of developing institutions."

Subsection (b) provides for application procedures.

Subsection (c) requires the Commissioner to consult with the Advisory Council and then to establish criteria for eligible expenditures..."

Section 305.

Subsection (a) authorizes the awarding of fellowships to graduate students and junior faculty members to teach at developing institutions.

Subsection (b) limits the period of award to two years and provides for annual payment of not more than $6500 plus a dependency allowance. (Senate Report pp. 71-73).

The Special Education Subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee held hearings between 1 February and 19 March 1965 with testimony offered by HEW Secretary Anthony J. Celebrezze, Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel, Vice Admiral Hyman G. Rickover, Homer D. Babbidge, representing the American Council on Education and the Association of American Colleges; Alfred T. Hill of the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges; Elbert K. Fretwell of the Association of Higher Education; Fred H. Harrington of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges; Charles Chapman of the American Association of Junior Colleges; Broadus Butler, Assistant to the Commissioner, Office of Education; Newman Hall, Executive Director, Commission on Engineering Education; George Wells Beadle, President, University of Chicago; and others.

The Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate held hearings in March, May and June 1965. Most of those named above (with the exception of Butler, Hall and Beadle) also testified at the Senate hearings. Among those who appeared in addition at the Senate hearings and whose contributions were relevant to the discussion of Title III as proposed were Elvis J. Stahr, representing the American Council on Education and the Association of American Colleges; Asa Knowles, President of Northeastern University; James Dixon, President of Antioch College; Isaac Beckes, of the American Association of Junior Colleges; Richard Hughes, Governor of New Jersey; Senators Clark, Bartlett, and McGovern, and others.

The Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate held hearings in March, May and June 1965. Most of those named above (with the exception of Butler, Hall and Beadle) also testified at the Senate hearings. Among those who appeared in addition at the Senate hearings and whose contributions were relevant to the discussion of Title III as proposed were Elvis J. Stahr, representing the American Council on Education and the Association of American Colleges; Asa Knowles, President of Northeastern University; James Dixon, President of Antioch College; Isaac Beckes, of the American Associatin of Junior Colleges; Richard Hughes, Governor of New Jersey; Senators Clark, Bartlett, McGovern, and others.

There was extensive testimony in the House and the Senate focusing on the intention of the proposed legislation, the means of implementing it, and, to some extent, the philosophy and values implicit in institutional support to struggling institutions. The hearings reflected the biases and vested interests of some, but also demonstrated the sensitivity and concern of educators to the needs of the less developed institutions and the constituents they served. Virtually all the witnesses affirmed the need to strengthen quality with financial support which Title III could provide. One of the most succinct and clear articulations of this came from Elbert K. Fretwell, Jr., Dean for Academic Development of the City University of New York. He appeared before the Senate Subcommittee on Education on behalf of the Association for Higher Education of which he was president. He said:

There are three pillars of strength needed to assure quality growth of the developing institution. The institution itself, as the bill indicates, must have the desire and potential. This bill would provide certain financial resources. This bill would provide the third indispensable factor: prime movers to get the job rolling.

Three particular prime movers deserve recognition here.

1. Priorities: The proposed Advisory Council on Developing Institutions will help determine which colleges should receive assistance. It will need to develop its own criteria. This Council, like others proposed by the bill, will need to be composed of especially wise and insightful men and women. They must be free to do their job.

2. Cooperative arrangements: Fruitful working relationships between developing institutions and stronger, long-established colleges and universities are already in effect. This procedure has proved to be beneficial. It remains to get more pairing and order relationships going. Arrangements with agencies and business enterprises also offer useful possibilities.

The bill is wise in that it suggests at least five categories of academic improvement activities without circumscribing any specified listing.*

3. National teaching fellowships: The highly qualified graduate students and junior faculty members contemplated as participants in this program may also be characterized, hopefully, by a high degree of idealism and desirable flexibility. Whether they elect to continue relationships with the developing institutions in question, or to turn to the long-established colleges and universities, higher education will be gained by this arrangement.

(Senate Hearings, p. 864)

Both the House and Senate testimony related to Title III focused on these general areas:

- the need for cooperative arrangements between "developing" institutions and established ones;
- whether or not to include junior and community colleges in the provision;

---

* This is a reference to the types of cooperative activities referred to in the legislation, section 304 (c) (1)-(5). Subsection (6) is miscellaneous "other arrangements." See pp. 20-21 of this text for listing.

- the need for an effective Advisory Council to provide continuing specific input;
- the lack of specificity in defining "developing institutions" and in articulating objectives and goals for these institutions;
- the emphasis on a national fellowship program as a principal vehicle to assist developing institutions.

The Need for Cooperative Arrangements

One of the principal proponents of the use of cooperative arrangements was Harold Pfautz who directed Brown University - Tougaloo College cooperative program. He described and advocated that two unique aspects be adopted for Title III. First, he said, "it is pervasive. That is, the resources of the (Brown) University stand ready to help Tougaloo in all of its operations, physical plant, administrations, students, curriculum, the whole gamut of operations" (House hearings, p. 144). Second, "it is opened with respect to time. We expect this to be not a matter of 2 or 3 years but 10 or 15 years" (House hearings, p. 144).

Representative Gibbons, in following up the testimony of Pfautz, said: "What you are doing is really a worthwhile service. As an educator, do you think a school like Tougaloo is ever really going to amount to anything" (House hearings, p. 145). Pfautz's response was to refer to the societal obligation of universities and an amorphous spirit, which he believed existed at Tougaloo: "This is something you can't construct, you can't build, and yet it is the fundamental basis of a liberal education" (House hearings p. 146).

Further testimony to support the idea of cooperative arrangements was provided in detail by Broadus Butler. His principal contention was that:

> The smaller colleges need the direct professional and technical resourcefulness and personnel involvement which can be supplied by the major universities and the major research universities need the humanizing influence of direct acquaintance knowledge of the small college and its students--particularly do they need the sensitivity which they are now gaining about the methodology by which small colleges have so successfully prepared and converted so many economically deprived youth into confident and capable young men and women. (House hearings, p. 180).

Butler also provided background information concerning the prototype relationships between large universities and small institutions. The seven he cited were:

University of Michigan -- Tuskegee Institute

Brown University -- Tougaloo College

Florida State College -- Florida A & M

University of Tennessee -- Knoxville College

University of Wisconsin -- North Carolina College at Durham
North Carolina A & T College at Greensboro
Texas Southern University

Cornell University -- Hampton Institute

Indiana University -- Stillman College

Butler concluded his prepared statement with a strong statement of support for the bill to bring "a measure of relief" in the following areas:

1. Inability to compete for highly qualified personnel.
2. Excessive teaching loads which militate against research and ancillary scholarly activity for the continued personal development of faculty members.

3. Disparity in grant allocations by both private and Government granting agencies as between a few large institutions and the many small colleges.

4. Inability of the small college to maintain both quality and continuity even in areas where they have strengths because of high personnel mobility and/or loss of contact by faculty with advances in their fields.

5. Poor instructional salaries which depress faculty motivation.

6. Lack of development offices and services to bring information and guidance to the administration of the colleges.

(House hearings, pp. 183-84).

His testimony emphasized his belief that Title III was important because it could provide "for more systematic exchange of faculty and (for) assistance to the smaller colleges...," and, in his opinion, the concept of cooperative arrangements was "one of the most encouraging developments in the present climate" (House hearings, p. 180).

Commissioner Keppel also emphasized the importance of cooperative arrangements: "the limited number of interinstitution programs already under way demonstrate that improvements are clearly achievable" (House hearings, p. 79).

Another advocate of cooperative arrangements was S. M. Nabrit, president of Texas Southern University who advocated "the use of unilateral and multilateral assistance pacts between and among institutions so that without dissipating the strengths of the well-developed institutions, the less well-developed ones can participate in a partnership of mutual advantage, learning, research and assistance" (House hearings, p. 476). Having had "some practical experience with cooperation with other universities" Dr. Nabrit said they can be "useful rather than damaging relationships" and suggested cooperation in the following

specific areas, among others:

- "planning to alleviate the chronic shortage of facilities"
- "libraries could be shared..."
- "broadening the horizons of the administrations and boards of the developing colleges"
- "placement, purchasing, development, joint degree programs, lyceums, and cultural programs."

(House hearings, pp. 476-77).

Because of his intensive experience as Executive Director of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation of the Big Ten Universities and the University of Chicago, Stanley F. Salwak spoke strongly in support of the cooperative arrangements concept. He said, "I strongly believe that what is needed are other CIC's -- CIC's tailored to fit the needs of smaller colleges, and of regional and state institutions; CIC's which will enable them to share the costs of operating quality programs. Many of these schools offer little or no graduate work, but a good deal of potential for cooperation lies in the strengthening of undergraduate programs" (House hearings, p. 843). He noted, however, that "the curious paradox is that, while sharing is ultimately an economy, establishing the groundwork for the development of quality cooperative projects involves the expenditure of funds which, however small, may be beyond the means of many institutions. In this context, therefore, developing institutions, which may desperately need the aid which a cooperative enterprise could provide, often cannot afford even to try to get such an enterprise off the ground" (House hearings, pp. 843-844.

Despite the general consensus among witnesses that interinstitutional cooperation was desirable and would prove beneficial to the developing institutions, there was some disagreement as to the nature of optimal cooperative arrangements and of their intended impact. Basically, three approaches to cooperation were articulated and advocated.

One, advanced by Admiral Rickover, was the "buddy system" derived from "a practice in the Navy where an experienced sailor will become the buddy of a raw recruit and help him find his way around" (House hearings, p. 229). Rickover had discussed this idea with numerous educators and said:

> There was general agreement that, to work at all, the "buddies" must not be too far apart scholastically. For instance, an Ivy League University buddying with an underpriveleged small college is not likely to work well. Among other things, it would be extremely difficult to persuade a first-rate Ivy League college professor to go to a college having lower standards. His special talent would, moreover, not be put to full use there, for it is predicated on his working with a highly gifted and well-educated student body. Human beings are not all that interchangeable. As one leading educator told me, if there is too great a difference in the kind of courses taught, the viewpoint from which they are discussed, the methods used, etc., an exchanges is not feasible. I should clarify that when I speak of a college having lower standards I mean this in the academic sense, not in terms of wealth or facilities which may actually be greater in the low than in the high standard college. Intellectual preeminence in many areas does not require much in the way of material resources. Of course, where expensive laboratories are needed, this is not the case.
>
> (House hearings, p. 229)

Rickover concluded, "But I cannot stress too much that if one institution is to take a proprietary or paternal interest in another, the two must not be too far apart scholastically -- they must have more in common than the same educational label" (House hearings, p. 230).

Rickover's testimony was consistent with ideas previously presented by Dr. Newman A. Hall, Executive Director of the Commission on Engineering Education. Speaking of his own experience in working to improve engineering schools, he said, "we conceived a plan of taking an institution which is relatively strong and associating this directly with a quite strong institution so over a period of years by very close working together we end up with two strong institutions which then gives you a much greater resource to spread throughout the entire educational system" (House hearings p. 194). He added, "we feel that the major difference between this concept (described above) which we have now carried forward successfully and which is presented in this bill, is the emphasis on institutional cooperation, rather than trying to urge an institution to lift itself up by its boot straps when you get two institutions together you get a multiplication effect which you cannot get any other way" (House hearings, p. 195).

Congresswoman Green responded to the idea of what she called "a layered program" and its advantages "in the specific case of the very strong institution and the relatively strong institution and making the latter in the same category as the former" (House hearings, p. 195). She then asked, "But if we take this ladder of academic excellence, and I am not sure that is the right term, and go down to the bottom of the ladder to the weakest institutions, how would your program work?" (House hearings, p. 195).

Hall's response—that such a program was not designed to serve the weakest institution—underscored a concern previously expressed by

Congresswoman Green, and reiterated at that hearing. She believed that such a program would increase the trend of a high percentage of Federal funds going to a small number of institutions, helping, in essence, the middle and upper range of institutions without meeting the needs of the "developing colleges."

Ms. Green had advocated a second approach to interinstitutional cooperation: "in the original drafting, our desire was to really strengthen the developing colleges by this exchange from the top" (House hearings, p. 846). She said:

> Title III was written with the thought there there would be an exchange between the "have" universities and the "have not." In other words, the most capable professors that might be given a year's leave from a "have" institutions would go to a "have not" institution; and the other theory, if I understand your testimony correctly (Dr. Salwak of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation), has been that this should be limited to an exchange between the university that is on the top rung of the ladder and the one that is on the second rung of the ladder, rather than the university that is on the top rung and the one that is on a much lower rung" (House hearings, p. 844).

She concluded her response to Dr. Salwak's approach by saying, "This was not really the purpose of title III, for a cooperative venture among the top 10 but, rather, we conceived it primarily to strengthen the Negro colleges in the South" (House hearings, p. 845).

Thus, while the testimony suggested that both the "top to bottom" concept of cooperation advanced by Ms. Green and the "layered" or "buddy" approaches recommended by Hall, Rickover and others would provide benefits to institutions and to the society, there was little consensus about how to achieve the greatest impact on morale, resources, personnel and programs through cooperative efforts.

A third approach to cooperation was offered by Salwak, with support from George W. Beadle, president of the University of Chicago. Salwak said, "there is a great need for clustering of institutions, small developing schools, cooperating, sharing with each other the strengths they have on each campus.... If you have 10 schools, with each institution having a strength, it would seem to me if you pool all of these strengths you are enhancing the program not tenfold but probably a hundredfold..." (House hearings, p. 844).

Rickover's testimony had also advocated "clustering": he said, in reference to the weak schools at the "bottom rung of the ladder," "they can help themselves to some extent by forming regional groups. As you know, this idea is being started. You will find there are probably a few good faculty members in any college. You can use them as seed. If they get together in a region they can split up courses and do a lot of good for themselves" (House hearings, p. 230).

These approaches represented divergent views of how to achieve the intention of assisting developing institutions, and how to utilize and appropriate funds authorized by its passage. Representative Pucinski summarized the dilemma succinctly:

> ...as I understand title III, what Mrs. Green has been trying to do here is to reach particularly this university isolated from the main currents of academic life. I am afraid that if we were to try to rewrite this title III or open it up, to broaden it, you might come right back to where you are today, with a $30 million fund available, one that would be consumed by the more fortunate universities; and we would find the smaller universities right back where we found them before" (House hearings, p. 851).

Despite the lengthy discussion concerning the form which cooperation might take and the potential divergence of emphasis which might result from the application of the different approaches suggested, the section dealing with cooperative arrangements (#304) was not altered from its broad form as a consequence of the hearings, and subsection (a) states simply that "such cooperative arrangements themselves may be between developing institutions, between developing institutions and other colleges and universities, and between developing institutions and organizations, agencies, and business entities."

Subsection (c) "requires the Commissioner to consult with the Advisory Council and then to establish criteria for eligible expenditures for which grants made under the section may be used. These criteria shall be designed to prevent the use of such grants for expenditures unnecessary to achieve the purposes of the past."

Thus, the enacted legislation did not specify the nature of cooperative arrangements, but it did suggest types of projects and activities for which grants could be made. These include:

1) Exchange of faculty or students, including arrangements for bringing visiting scholars to developing institutions.

2) Faculty and administration improvement programs utilizing training, education (including fellowships leading to advanced degrees), internships, research participation, and other means;

3) Introduction of new curriculums and curricular materials;

4) Development and operation of cooperative education programs involving alternate periods of academic study and business

or public employment;

5) Joint use of facilities such as libraries or laboratories, including necessary books, materials and equipment; and

6) Other arrangements which offer promise of strengthening the academic programs and the administration of developing institutions.

The House Report, in summarizing the idea of cooperative arrangements said: "An unusually effective method of maximizing the strength of our limited national resources for education is the interinstitutional cooperative program...These arrangements enable institutions to share their strengths and, at the same time, to compensate for their weaknesses. They are of special assistance to the smaller colleges which are most crippled by lack of resources" (House Report, p. 17)

The report continued: "The committee did not want to omit the flexibility of these programs so it left open a wide range of possibilities for cooperative programs" (House Report, p. 19).

Whether or Not to Include Junior or Community Colleges

The position of the Administration was to limit Title III support to four year institutions. Commissioner Keppel expressed this: "Our thinking was this. At this moment in time, and as far as we could get in the next 5 years, the greatest problem was the baccalaureate, the degree, 4 year college. I think it is just a question of priority" (House hearings, p. 134).

This priority was challenged by several educators who believed that two year and community colleges should be included. Among those advancing that position were Homer Babbidge, speaking on behalf of the American Council on Education and the Assocation of American Colleges, Elbert K. Fretwell, Jr., president of the Association of Higher Education, and Charles Chapman of the American Association of Junior Colleges.

Another person supporting the inclusion of two year colleges for eligibility was Stanley Salwak, Executive Director of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation: "There is an excellent opportunity, too, for introducing cooperative arrangements into junior and community colleges. I did not find that in this bill. Strengthening these programs is vitally important, because thousands of their graduates enter 4-year institutions as advanced students or juniors" (House hearings, p. 843). Salwak's position was strongly supported by Representative James Roosevelt. Salwak then added:

> The community college program is probably, again, the most rapidly increasing program in the country and has been, judging from the number of new institutions that are being developed in terms of enrollment. Such institutions were established for a number of reasons, one being the financial inability of students, of course, to attend away from home a 4-year institution in order to get a degree. So they would spend 2 years in a community where they live, hopefully to stay at home, and then transfer as juniors and seniors. It seems to me that if we are really concerned about improving the position of developing institutions, and I keep in mind uppermost always the student factor--the most important reason for even being here and talking about higher education is the students--they need a good deal of support because funding is never adequate at that level for a number of reasons. One could discuss many ramifications of the problem. They desperately need assistance, particularly in programs that are high cost pro-

grams--technical assistance programs. A liberal arts program perhaps is the least expensive to develop. But there are many others that are very expensive. If you have a cluster of junior colleges in an area of community colleges, where you might develop a strength here-here and here--it seems to me you are reinforcing all of them and you are also providing a better program of education for the students who will eventually go on to a 4-year program as such. (House hearings, p. 848).

Despite the testimony favoring support of two year post-secondary institutions, "the committee decided that in order to best meet this need (to raise the quality of college perparation) highest priority should be given to degree-granting 4 year colleges which have been struggling to maintain and develop their own quality as regular 4 year institutions" (House report), p. 18).

This view did not prevail in the Senate where concern was raised about the omission of two year colleges. Keppel was questioned closely on this point by Senators Javits and Clark; Keppel said that since junior colleges were eligible under provisions of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1974, it was appropriate to focus on the 4 year colleges in Title III. Elvis Stahr, Jr. representing the American Council on Education and the Association of American Colleges, spoke strongly in support of including two year institutions: "Some of our institutions of higher education most seriously in need of development assistance through cooperative interinstitutional arrangements and through special faculty improvement programs are our 2 year junior and community colleges--both white and Negro. The American council strongly urges that the language of section 302 (b) be amended to include community and junior colleges" (Senate hearings, p. 354). During the questioning of Dr. Stahr

by Senators Javits and Morse, the issue of the Administration's reasons for excluding the 2 year institutions was raised, and a request was made to the Department (of Health, Education and Welfare) for a memorandum "first, giving their reasons for not including the junior and community colleges in the programming; and, two, justifying any opposition, if they have any, to an amendment which I think (Senator Morse is speaking) ought to be introduced carrying out President Stahr's recommendation" (Senate hearings, p. 371).

The memorandum is as follows:

The Omission of the Junior Colleges and Other Less Than 4-Year Colleges From Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (S. 600)(H.R. 3220)

There are two major problems in higher education to which this title is addressed. First is the problem of the inability of smaller colleges to compete for topflight faculty. Second is the related problem of the increasing numbers of students who are college qualified but find no room in large universities. It is essential that small colleges improve their capacity to receive these students and provide them with a high-quality undergraduate education. These problems can best be resolved by investment in the development and improvement of existing 4-year institutions as a matter of first priority.

The education goal which is sought through investment in selected degree granting colleges is the quality of college preparation which will more closely approach the crux of the national manpower and brainpower need than the more limited types of programs offered in most 2-year colleges can now achieve. It is crucial, moreover, that the bill make it possible for sufficient support to go to a single institution to make its own developmental plan realistic and possible of some permanent rather than fleeting improvement.

Thirty million dollars would average only one-half million dollars to 60 institutions. However, one-half million dollars wisely invested in 60 colleges or one-fourth million dollars in 120 colleges would produce greater benefits to the Nation than an average of less than $20,000 scattered among, say, 1,600 colleges and junior colleges. Such a dissipation of funds as would be occasioned by the inclusion of junior colleges would accomplish little, if any, long-term improvement in any of the institutions.

The investment by the Federal Government envisioned in Title III is intended to combine present planning with long-term benefits to the Nation. Resources for immediate implementation, innovation, exchange of resources, and experimentation in Title III are aimed at colleges which are in a position to make maximum use of these measures to improve faculty performance and institutional production through strengthened curriculum, administration, and personnel. The primary emphasis is upon improving the capability of the colleges to hold and to gain a fair share of the ablest scholars and teachers, and ultimately to attract and better serve the larger numbers of students who are presently qualified and those who will soon become eligible for college. Most of these students will have little chance for acceptance in large universities or even the more expensive among the smaller institutions, but also most of them will be better served by full 4-year colleges than by junior colleges.

The title already includes consideration of 4-year degree-granting colleges which are not now accredited but which are reasonably in a position to become accredited with further help and planning. The chance of any significant amounts of money reaching such unaccredited colleges after the requests and plans of the accredited colleges are considered in itself rather small because so many accredited colleges are in the financial, personnel, and equipment strain and dilemma to which Title III is addressed. To add junior colleges to this group would make even more remote the possibility of getting assistance to them even though they would be nominally included in the scope of the title.

Finally, there are at least three types of colleges which are less than degree-granting colleges and which are to be distinguished from special purpose schools like business colleges or secretarial training schools which offer certificates and sometimes carry the name "college." One is the newly organized colleges which are designed to become 4-year degree-granting colleges, but which are developing on a year-by-year basis to full maturity. The College of the Virgin Islands is such an example. Even this type of college is presently excluded by priority considerations and if and when a serious look is taken at second priorities, it may be that a decision should be made between this type of college and the junior college. The second type is the traditional 2-year junior college which serves the combined function of providing 2-year terminal programs of a subprofessional nature and curriculums to prepare students to proceed to senior college major programs. The third type is the relatively recent 2-year community college which is usually under the jurisdiction of the local board of education and which is predominantly vocationally oriented, and consists preponderantly of 2-year terminal curriculums. Some students from community colleges do proceed to senior colleges but the community college program does not usually have a

> college completion emphasis to the same degree as the traditional junior college.
>
> If Title III is amended to include junior college, this would introduce the complex problem of distinguishing between these types of less than 4-year colleges in terms of priorities. It is our judgment that these colleges have a special and serious problem but that they should be approached separately from the immediate problems of Title III.
>
> If, however, there is an insistence upon including less than degree-granting institutions in Title III, first priority among them should be given to those institutions, like the College of the Virgin Islands, which are already specifically designed and in process of becoming regular 4-year degree-granting institutions. This will prevent the small budget of the section being flooded with requests from rapidly proliferating community colleges and junior colleges which will never be in a position to accomplish the objectives of the bill.
>
> Senate hearings, pp. 372-73).

Richard Hughes, Governor of New Jersey, advocated the inclusion of the two year colleges because he believed they were a vehicle for "an intending student who desired so much a college education bound up in the problems of poverty, and lack of assets, family assets, and ability to get there, and (then) he would settle for the 2 years" (Senate hearings, III, p. 1004). This point was also made by Isaac Beckes representing the American Association of Junior Colleges. Representative Richard Hanna of California said, in testifying on behalf of including the 2 year colleges, "it is the junior college that provides the important safety channel for the 'late bloomers' and for those others who are motivated later in life to seek their full potential through education, and, finally, it is the junior college that provides the major portion of adult education..." (Senate hearings, III. p. 1242).

As a result of this testimony, Senator Morse introduced an ammendment to include the two year colleges. The report of the committee

stated:

> The bill as introduced limited participation under Title III to degree-granting 4-year colleges. While the committee recognizes the need for substantial assistance to 4-year colleges which are struggling to maintain and develop their own quality, it was felt that the similar needs of our smaller junior colleges and technical institutions should be given equal emphasis. The committee is keenly aware of the progress which junior colleges and technical institutions are making to provide educational opportunity to an ever-larger number of our Nation's youth. Some of these 2-year institutions are making remarkable efforts to improve their programs, and it would, in the committee's view, be unfair to exclude such institutions from eligibility for financial assistance under Title III.
>
> In order to assure that adequate funds are available for both 4-year and 2-year institutions, the bill, as reported, authorizes equal sums for each category. Instead of taking away from the requested authorization for 4-year colleges, the committee recommends an authorization for Title III nearly double the original request, but the total authorized for this title is only a modest investment in terms of the return which the Nation can expect in improved educational quality.
>
> (Senate report, p. 33)

As a result of ths, the proposed legislation, upon the recommendation of the Conference committee, included provisions for both two and four year institutions. Section 301(b)(2) and (3) read as follows:

> (2) Of the sums appropriated pursuant to this section for any fiscal year, 78 per centum shall be available only for carrying out the provisions of this title with respect to developing institutions which plan to award one or more bachelor's degrees during such year.
>
> (3) The remainder of the sums so appropriated shall be available only for carrying out the provisions of this title with respect to developing institutions which do not plan to award such a degree during such year.
>
> (Conference report, p. 12)

The Need for an Effective Advisory Council

Much of the testimony and discussion relating to Title III focused on the need for an Advisory Council, particularly in view of the decisions to make the nature of cooperative arrangements very broad. The legislation mandated the establishment of an Advisory Council: "The Commissioner must establish an Advisory Council on Developing Institutions in the Office of Education" (Senate report, P. 72). The responsibilities and functions of the Council were also specific:

> The council will advise the Commissioner on policy matters arising in the administration of Title III, and shall particularly assist the Commissioner in identifying those developing institutions through which the purposes of Title III can best be achieved, and in the establishment of priorities to be used in approving applications under Title III. The Commissioner may appoint special advisory and technical experts and consultants to assist the Council in discharging its functions.
> (Senate report, p. 72)

The Administration's views concerning the Advisory Council were expressed by Broadus Butler: "The bill proposes that there be established an advisory committee on developing colleges under the Commissioner's chairmanship and I suppose the implication is that the committee itself will establish certain policy guidelines to distinguish between those to whom the grants should go initially as the first priority and those who should wait" (House harings, p. 187). Butler then concluded: "The advisory council, I suppose, would provide a pattern of guidelines to the administrators as to the kinds of directions they may take to strengthen their weaknesses or amplify their strengths" (House hearings, p. 187).

Commissioner Keppel was quite specific in his statements on the role of the Advisory group. Speaking of the term "developing institution," he said "It is not subject to precise statistical definition, but there are, in our judgment, five factors, which taken together could be used by the Advisory Committee" (House hearings, p. 120).

The five factors which Keppel referred to had been included in his prepared statement:

> 1) A developing institution has limited financial support, a small endowment, and alumni and friends with limited capital to offer.
> 2) It usually has relatively high dropout and transfer rates. These may often stem from a poor admissions policy, but whatever the cause, the result is often a course of study heavy with remedial work and light on challenging assignments.
> 3) It will likely have a slim catalog of offerings within minimum programs. In some smaller institutions, one or two faculty members may constitute a total academic department.
> 4) It can boast of little in the way of laboratories, libraries, or other instructional facilities identified with higher education. Because of this failing the information it offers students is usually minimal and often obsolete, since it cannot adequately keep pace with the knowledge explosion. Some danger signs are the following: less than 50,000 books in the library for an enrollment of 700 students; less than 3 professional librarians on the staff; a library budget of less than 5 cents of the total school budget dollar expended. (Half of our 4-year schools have less than the required 50,000 volumes; more than half of all our institutions of higher education fail in the other respects.)
> 5) It has difficulty in attracting faculty members of high quality and cannot hold those it does manage to attract. Such weaknesses are especially apparent among those institutions with fewer than 200 full-time instructors. Fewer have attained doctoral degrees; and their average annual earnings are nearly $1,500 less than those of their colleagues in the universities and stronger colleges, and about $700 less than instructors in all 4-year institutions. The faculty members of such institutions normally are called upon to shoulder heavier teaching loads than their colleagues elsewhere in higher education, with result that they conduct less original research, publish fewer books, and present fewer profes-

sional papers and articles. Exhibit 3* is dramatic evidence of these disparities.

(House hearings, pp. 78-79)

One of the few people to raise questions about the effectiveness of the proposed Advisory Council was Admiral Rickover who urged greater direct government control: "Perhaps, where need is great, you might begin to grant money without demanding compliance with a standard--as a starter. But as soon as possible such standards ought to be made mandatory" (House hearings, p. 231). He added, "Pretty soon you will find the Office of Education consisting of nothing but masses of committees and boards--an administrator's delight" (House hearings, p. 231).

The legislation proposed did not provide a review or appeal mechanism for institutions not selected, and Dr. Butler was asked about that. He replied: "I don't think that there would be any objection to either defining this as a criterion for the advisory committee or to inclusion of it in the bill" (House hearings, p. 188).

Thus, although there was relatively little discussion about the Advisory Committee, its functions as expressed by representatives of the Administration were clearly not perfunctory, since the Council would assist the Commissioner in defining and evaluating the criteria to be used both in implementing the purposes of the title, and in making awards. The Advisory Council was proposed as a vehicle through which much of the intended mission of Title III, as articulated by its proponents, was to be implemented. In proposing the creation of an Advisory Council, the

---

* Exhibit 3 is presented as Table 2.

Table 2
(Supporting material presented by Francis Keppel)

Strengthening Developing Institutions

A. Levels of highest earned degrees of full-time teaching faculty, 1962-63
(in percent)

	Doctorate	Master's	Bachelor's
Institutions having fewer than 200 faculty members	40	41	19
Universities	58	25	17
All 4-year institutions	51	33	16

B. Salaries of full-time teaching faculty, 1962-63

	Median Salary
Institutions having fewer than 200 faculty members	$7,184
Universities	8,624
All 4-year institutions	7,811

Average faculty salaries in 4-year institutions, 1962-63, by enrollment size

Enrollment	Average salary
Below 200	$5,480
200 to 499	6,171
500 to 999	6,734
1,000 to 2,499	7,506
2,500 to 4,999	7,800
5,000 to 9,999	8,194
10,000 and over	9,204

C. Full-time teaching faculty teaching excessive number of hours, 1962-63

	Percent of faculty teaching 16 hours or more a week
Institutions having fewer than 200 faculty members	16
All universities	5
All 4-year institutions	10

D. Full-time teaching faculty who have published books and articles and who are conducting separately budgeted research, 1962-63
(in percent)

	Published books	Published articles	Conducting separately budgeted research
Institutions having fewer than 200 faculty members	13	40	10
All universities	30	71	34
All 4-year institutions	22	57	23

(Senate hearings, pp. 285-86).

Note: This material was presented to both the House and Senate identically; the chart has been reproduced from the Senate material where it appeared as Exhibit 7.

Administration hoped to blunt the criticism that the criteria for eligibility and selection, for determining progress and completion, were too vague.

As is apparent in the following section, that criticism was persistent and evident throughout the hearings.

The Lack of Specificity in Defining "Developing Institutions" and in Articulating Objectives and Goals for These Institutions

Throughout the hearings in the House and Senate concerning Title III there was concern expressed by Committee members about the vagueness of language in defining eligible institutions and in establishing goals for institutions which might be funded under the provisions of the Title. The principal spokesmen for the Administration in this context were Francis Keppel and Broadus Butler. In his testimony, Dr. Butler attempted to explain the term "developing institution."

> I also think the term 'developing' is quite appropriate here because it has implied in it that a college shall have a purpose and an explicit plan which it will submit to this advisory committee for examination on its merit; that there is the procedure for review to determine whether or not standards are being met in terms of improvement of the areas about which the proposal is designed. The term 'developing' does another thing.
>
> It avoids the problem of proffering assistance while at the same time stigmatizing the colleges because of size. I would much prefer this term to a term like weak or undeveloped something of this sort. Developing is a positive concept. It will lend assistance to those college administrators and those college faculties who desire to move in a positive direction and who are willing to submit to standards by which they will be judged in this positive movement. And particularly in the case of small colleges, there are many of them which are proud and very old colleges. They have had periods of high achievement and periods of mediocrity and periods of low achievement. Much of this has been determined not merely by the level of external support, but by the quality of the administration at the particular time.
>
> (House hearings, p. 187)

Despite this attempt to describe rather than define a developing institution, there were still many unanswered questions. Congressman Griffin said: "As I look at the guidelines...it seems to me it is pretty much a matter of discretion with the Commissioner with very little in the way of anything objective or concrete except the fact that they have to award degrees, be accredited or be making progress, and are seriously handicapped in efforts to improve such staff and service by lack of financial resources" (House hearings, p. 187). A similar view was expressed by Congressman Sickles: "I have some confusion in trying to really understand what we are specifically going to be able to do under the bill" (House hearings, p. 184). Congresswoman Green reiterated this concern: "It seems to me that any college could qualify. I wonder if you and the members of the staff would provide us with some language which would tighten up this section so that we would more narrowly define the colleges that we really intend to help under Title III" (House hearings, p. 189).

These concerns expressed by members of Congress were responded to by Keppel and Butler through their attempts to identify characteristics of developing institutions even though specific definitions and objectives were not articulated in the legislation. Their efforts to identify characteristics have been described earlier (see page 29 for Keppel's list and page 14 for Butler's), but, for convenience are summarized below:

Characteristics of Developing Institutions

Described by Francis Keppel	Described by Broadus Butler
1) Has limited financial support and small endowment	1) Has inability to compete for highly qualified personnel
2) Has relatively high dropout and transfer rates	2) Has excessive teaching loads militating against research and other activities for continued personal development
3) Has a slim catalogue of offerings	4) Has inability to maintain quality and continuity because of high personnel mobility and loss of contact by faculty with advances in their fields.
5) Has difficulty attracting and retaining high quality faculty members	5) Has poor instructional salaries, depressing motivation
	6) Has lack of development office and services to bring information and guidance to the administration.

(from House hearings, pp. 78-79, 183-84).

Congressman Griffin reiterated his concern about the broadness and vagueness of the language: "Of course if a program with such wide discretionary latitude is administered properly, I suppose it can work very well. It would seem to me that we in Congress have quite a serious continuing responsibility; however, if we are not going to try to lay down policy a little more definite than this we must look over their shoulder and see what is going on, otherwise I do not think we would be fulfilling our responsibility" (House hearings, p. 188).

Out of this extended discussion came refinement of the language of Title III and two different attempts to make specific the characteristics and objectives of the institutions intended to be served. The first, sec-

tion 301, described their mission and condition:

> The purpose of this title is to assist in raising the academic quality of colleges which have the desire and potential to make a substantial contribution to the higher education resources of our Nation but which for financial and other reasons are struggling for survival and are isolated from the main currents of academic life.
>
> (Conference report, p. 12)

The second section, section 302, defined "developing institutions"

> As used in this title the term "developing institution" means a public or nonprofit educational institution in any State which--
>
> a) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a secondary school, or the recognized equivalent of such certificate;
>
> b) is legally authorized to provide, and provides within the State, an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree, or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, or offers not less than a two-year program in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences which is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, or other technological fields which require the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles of knowledge;
>
> c) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association determined by the Commissioner to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered or is, according to such an agency or association, making reasonable progress toward accreditation;
>
> d) has met the requirement of clauses (a) and (b) during the five academic years preceding the academic year for which it seeks assistance under this title;
>
> e) is making a reasonable effort to improve the quality of its teaching and administrative staffs and of its student services;
>
> f) is, for financial or other reasons, struggling for survival and is isolated from the main currents of academic life;
>
> g) meets such other requirements as the Commissioner may prescribe by regulation; and
>
> h) is not an institution, or department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.
>
> (Conference report, p. 12)

Keppel understood that some of the institutions identified as "developing" were in imminent danger of collapse without "the special help that this new title will provide." He also recognized the academic limitations and the inadequacy of personnel and of resources of some of those institutions; he said, "the sad fact is that many students are now finishing high school with more advanced information than is taught in some of our small colleges," but, he concluded, "it is unrealistic to think of getting rid of smaller, weaker colleges at a time when the number of young people of college age is reaching record heights" (House hearings, p. 79).

Title III, as enacted, provided the Commissioner with the assistance and advice of the Advisory Council, with broad discretionary authority to define objectives and establish priorities within the parameters of the definition and description of "developing institutions" as cited above.

This was to be accomplished through two mechanisms: the establishment of cooperative arrangement, which has been described and discussed previously, and through the establishment of a national teaching program which is discussed in the following section.

The Emphasis on a National Teaching Fellowship Program

Both the 88th and 89th Congresses had dealt extensively with issues related to improving teaching throughout the United States. Some of the emphasis arose directly as a consequence of concerns and recommendations made by the Panel on Educational Research and Development

chaired by Jerrold R. Zacharias in the area of preservice and inservice education of teachers (Zacharias, 1964). The largest effort in this area was the development of the National Teacher Corps, which was Title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965, providing funds for those who sought to become teachers and for experienced teachers seeking new skills particularly in inner city areas (i.e., the Black ghetto) and areas of rural poverty. This concern for improved teaching was manifest in Title III through the National Teaching Fellowships (section 305).

The intent of this segment of the legislation was to provide a second mechanism--the first was support for cooperative arrangements--for strengthening smaller colleges through "the establishment of a program of national teaching fellowships to be awarded by the Commissioner to highly qualified graduate students and junior faculty members of stronger institutions to encourage them to teach at developing institutions" (Senate Report, p. 35). The Report continued:

> Some private groups, recognizing the need in smaller colleges for good teaching, have developed programs designed to encourage young teachers to spend a year or two at developing institutions. The Woodrow Wilson Interns and the Southern Teaching Program, Inc., have both had some success in this area. The main limitation of these programs has been a lack of financial support. It appears that the same sort of idealism that has motivated countless Peace Corps volunteers exists also among some of these young teachers. But it is not enough for them to want to volunteer. It must be made possible for them to volunteer. The national teaching fellowships can open this possibility to them.
>
> These fellowships can promote higher quality teaching and revitalization of faculties and academic programs in the developing colleges. They can at the same time provide an outlet for the idealism of young teachers and give these academicians a broader range of personal experience which should strengthen their teaching abilities wherever they might be.
>
> (Senate Report, p. 35).

where there are sufficient numbers of teachers, trained professors, and skilled people, an exchange program is one of the ways of spreading as much knowledge to as many students as we can possible do today" (House hearings, pp. 38-39).

Broadus Butler viewed the fellowship program and its potential for faculty exchanges as "one of the most promising features of these relationships" (House hearings, p. 181). He saw these activities as complementary to the senior faculty exchanges which could be established through cooperative arrangements, and as a necessary adjunct to existing federal and private programs.

Despite the debate and discussion reported here, there was virtually no serious opposition to the intention of Title III, and it was enacted into law in substantially the format proposed by the President. In testifying in support of Title III, Secretary Celebreeze said "it is going to be a sad day in America when the private institution begins to disappear, and this would be one way of assisting them greatly" (House hearings, p. 39). The intention of the legislation is perhaps best summarized by Dr. Butler:

> Our nation will need every single college that can be developed and prepared to receive and educate the young people who are now--and justly so--being geared to feel a responsibility to become educated, and whose expectations must not be frustrated by our failure either to provide places for them or a quality education

Keppel was a strong advocate of the fellowship program through which he said, "new life is promised to the developing institutions" (House hearings, p. 79). Keppel believed that the provisions of the program would make teaching opportunities at developing institutions attractive to young academic professionals: "Perhaps some of the motivation we have seen in the Peace Corps is relevant here. I would be surprised if we weren't swamped with the people who want to take part in this for the first year or two" (House hearings, p. 121).

Herman Branson of Howard University also advocated the fellowship program, and urged that even larger sums be appropriated for its implementation. He had worked perviously with the ad hoc committee of the American Council on Education which had been formed at the request of President Kennedy to examine some of the problems related to Negro colleges. One of the problems addressed by that group related to teaching. Branson said, "we believe that, if anything, the amount of money asked for is far, far inadequate...We are discouraged by the amount of private money" (House hearings, p. 199).

Dr. Nabrit saw the fellowships not only as an opportunity to bring in young, recently trained and enthusiastic faculty members, but also as a means of making "possible (the) release of faculty persons for training..." and "would also permit the instructors in the smaller colleges to keep in contact with mainstream approaches to teaching and research" (House hearings, p. 476). This reiterated a point made by Secretary Celebreeze in his opening testimony; he said that "until we reach the point where the economic level of the colleges is raised to the point

when they attend college.
(House hearings, p. 183).

The criteria which evolved and are described here were to aid in achieving that "quality education."

During 1967 and 1968 the 90th Congress held hearings with the intention of amending the Higher Education Act and increasing its appropriation. The hearings presented members of congress with an opportunity to hear assessments of Title III and its impact on developing institutions. Harold Howe, Commissioner of Education, summarized the program:

> One of the most unique programs to be incorporated into legislation affecting higher education in the United States is the Title III program to strengthen developing institutions. In Fiscal Year 1966, Title III support was in the form of $4.3 million for cooperative arrangements and $.7 million for national teaching fellowships. The cooperative arrangements are significant in that they allow stronger colleges and universities and industry to "adopt" or "sponsor" the development of those institutions in the United States which are struggling for survival and are isolated from the main currents of academic life. Last year, 84 cooperative arrangements were funded involving 115 developing institutions, 66 cooperating or strong institutions, and nine business entities. Included in the cooperative arrangements were student and faculty exchanges, faculty improvement program to release members for further higher education, curriculum improvement programs in remedial reading, English, and mathematics, student services for cultural exchanges and visiting scholars programs. The funding of these arrangements allowed projects to be established in Oregon for intensive faculty work sessions to improve instruction in psychology, art, Spanish, sociology, history, and English; in Indiana, a program to strengthen business administration and economics; and in Florida, an inter-institutional five-college program for Asian studies.

and "is, for financial or other reasons,, struggling for survival and is isolated from the main currents of academic life" are less tangible, requiring a degree of subjective analysis and judgment..

In its first two years of operation, the division of College Support has relied heavily upon the advice and assistance of its Advisory Council. The Council has provided guidance in the establishment of guidelines.

It has seemed wise to avoid a strict definition of developing insitutions which might preclude assistance to a number of institutions defining themselves as developing. The data accumulating from this source have proved to be invaluable in establishing more objective characteristics for the judgmental aspects of the law. As our experience develops, we see emerging a profile which begins to distinguish a developing institution from all others. For example, these institutions bear the following range of characteristics within the categories utilized by accrediting associations as indices to quality.

(House hearings 1967, pp. 100-101)

The third section of the material submitted contained the "emerging critiera for determining eligibility as a developing institution":

1) Extreme financial limitations such as salaries of less than $6,000, unrestricted endowment less than $3 million, percentage cost of instruction per student less than 45 percent and expenditures for library less than 5 percent.
2) High faculty-student ratio.
3) Limited library holdings (one third of the generally accepted minimum requirements).
4) Low percentage (less than one third) of the faculty holding PhD degrees.
5) High percentage of students (two thirds) on scholarships and grants in aid.
6) Poor physical facilities--lack of funds for upkeep and maintenance.
7) Poorly prepared students.
8) Cultural, social, professional, and academic isolation.
9) Little or no foundation, alumni, or corporate support.
10) Little or no sponsored research. No faculty publications.
11) Program offerings and counseling services out of step with new opportunities in careers and vocational occupations.
12) Degree of concern for the development of remedial or corrective programs.
13) Dearth of faculty with scholarly backgrounds and achievements accompanied by inability to attract highly accomplished faculty due to poor institutional incentive.
14) Inadequate development offices and limited capacity for long-range planning.

(House hearings 1967, p. 102)

At the conclusion of this section, the following was added: "Hopefully, at the end of a three-year period, the program shall have matured sufficiently to have developed more objective guidelines for the appraisal of basic institutional strength within the universe of developing institutions" (House hearings 1967, p. 102).

In addition to this detailed information provided by the Office of Education, there was a comprehensive assessment of the program presented by Harold Pfautz who had served as coordinator of the Brown-Tougaloo College cooperative program. He began his testimony with this statement:

> Significantly, this title involved a much needed innovation in Federal aid to higher education; that is. direct financial aid, not for buildings, facilities, or research, but for basic educational operations: curriculum development, faculty and administrative development, student services, and planning operations.
>
> In addition, the national teaching fellowship program sought further to be helpful in staffing the developing colleges.
>
> We are now beginning our third year of experience. And, while I have not been privy to the inner workings of the operation, I have had the honor of serving as an adviser to the Office of Education as a member of the panels which have reviewed the proposals, in addition to my tenure as coordinator of the Tougaloo-Brown program.
>
> In the first place, I would say that the Office of Education and especially the division of college support have done a really magnificent job in administering the title to date. Despite the press of time and the problems of setting up lines of communication between Washington and the myriad of institutions throughout the country, the moneys have been allocated with a minimum of the bureaucratic difficulties usually encountered in such an estensive and complicated program. Moreover, I am personally convinced that these moneys have performed exceedingly useful functions which are precisely along the lines of intent of the Congress.
>
> Through the medium of cooperating working relationships literally hundreds of colleges outside the mainstream of higher ecucation have been brought into contact with our more developed institutions.
>
> Correlatively, these contacts and the funds received for such programs have, to a greater or lesser extent, at the very minimum served a significant catalytic function: They have acted to shake

> The other important facet of Title III is the National Teaching Fellowships Program. In 1966, 263 fellowships were awarded. This figure however, did not even begin to meet the application demands of the colleges because judging from the requests almost all the developing institutions have an overwhelming need for additional faculty. Nearly 1,000 fellowships were requested either in conjunction with a cooperative arrangement or separately. Fiscal Year 1967, $30 million has been appropriated for these two aspects of the Title III program. Requests for these funds, due to the need for support and the success of the program, are expected to exceed appropriations.
>
> (House hearings, 1967, pp. 59-60)

Howe, who was accompanied at the hearings by Peter Muirhead, Associate Commissioner for Higher Education, was asked to try to distinguish "developing institutions" from "developed one." In response, they submitted material in four main sections: 1) the basic statutory requirements; 2) a statistical profile of developing institutions; 3) an interpretation of what appeared to be emerging criteria; and, 4) a list of funded institutions. The statistical profile appears as Table 3.

The following is a review of the statutory requirements (and an explanatory note) as presented at the House hearings:

> In order to be considered for support under Title III of Higher Education Act of 1965, Strengthening Developing Institutions, an institutions of higher education must first meet the basic requirements as set forth in Section 302 of the Act, "Definition of 'Developing Institution.'"
>
> It must be a "public or nonprofit educational institution in any state which--
>
> ... (Same criteria as Section 302, Conference report, p. 12, a) through h). See p. 32 of this paper) ...
>
> A majority of these items are clear-cut and may be readily applied to applicant institutions. However, such requirements as "is making a reasonable effort to improve the quality of its teaching and administrative staffs and of its students' services

Table 3

Characteristics of Funded Developing Institutions
1967

	Mean Average	Moving Toward the "Acceptable Level" of
1. Enrollment	$1,089	1,500
2. Endowment income or annual state appropriation	$125,000	$900,000
3. Tuition	$556	$1,500
4. Educational and general expenditures	$1,141,000	$2,107,400
5. Educational and general expenditures per student	$1,048	$1,740
6. Faculty [size]	66	98
7. % of faculty holding doctorate	26%	52%
8. Student/faculty ratio	20	12
9. Library volumes	51,000	157,000

(House hearings 1967, p. 101)

up, so to speak, the operations of the smaller and less developed schools.

(House hearings 1968, p. 329).

Pfautz then reviewed the "experience (with Title III) to date: "I would estimate that despite the minimum funds appropriated, from one quarter to one fifth of all of the Nation's 4-year colleges, in addition to the numerous junior colleges, have been touched by the act. More than 60 percent of the predominantly Negro colleges have received funds.

"Indeed, true to the original thrust of the legislation, more than half of the funds available to 4-year colleges have gone to the predominantly Negro schools.

"Finally, of the approximately 60 grants of more than $100,000 in fiscal 1967, 51 have been made to such institutions."

(House hearings 1968, p. 330).

Pfautz had concluded on the basis of the evidence and experiences he had observed that "a new title should be proposed which would precisely be oriented to providing grants to undergraduate institutions for curriculum, faculty and administrative development, student services, etc., without the baggage of the cooperative concept" (House hearings 1968, p. 331). He also argued in support of larger individual grants: "Institutional grants for higher education must be of significant size as to make an impact and closely reviewed, in the case of the smaller institutions, so as to be not so large as to constitute a burden of absorption and administration, especially in regard to the implicatios of such grants for future commitments." (House hearings, 1968, p. 333).

Pfautz' testimony evoked a response from Representative Gibbons which, while admiring his candor, nevertheless raised questions similar to those expressed in the original hearings:

> I want to thank Dr. Pfautz. We seldom ever get someone who is as blunt and critical as you have been in some of these things, and we appreciate that.
>
> Let me go back to your experience at Tougaloo. Perhaps I am the person on this committee who was most skeptical of Title III, because at that time, with every institution under the definition we put in the act, from Harvard and Stanford and all of them on down--and I don't say they are the tops but just assuming for the sake of argument that they are--it looked like every institution could qualify as a developing institution.
>
> You are very correct in saying that this was a direct aid for building of the facilities of the institution, and, also, for its educational operation.
>
> I was worried that we had not put enough guidelines and boundaries on the activities of Title III. So I guess I am the person who probably objected most and had the most to do with cutting down the amount of money we put in the Title.
>
> (House hearings 1968, p. 334).

Another aspect of the Higher Education Act which was discussed during the hearings concerned the addition of faculty emeriti to the fellowship program. John T. King, president of Huston-Tillotson College, said that the numerous older faculty members, some of whom believed they were at the height of their teaching careers, would be willing to serve in the developing colleges were such an am amendment added.

And, L. H. McCloney, president of Paul Quinn College, made this comment:

> Title III grants have provided our colleges with the impetus toward full development. This legislation, both in concept and in administration has been a vital step toward strengthening American higher education and correcting past inequities. A reasonable assurance that such support would continue would assure that such of these colleges as do have the necessary desire and potential to emerge from isolation will so shape themselves as to preserve their

> long traditions of humanitarian service while adding breadth and depth to that service, as they enter the mainstream and gain the strength to fulfill roles for which their history has prepared them as the history of no other class of institutions has. (Senate hearings 1968, p. 1614).

As data concerning developing institutions has become available there have been efforts made to illustrate relationships among miminum standards, standards of funded institutions, and standards of developed institutions. One such effort was made in 1971 by the Division of College Support, directed by Willa Player. That material is presented as Table 4. It contrasts the minimum standard, with the characteristic of funded institutions, with criteria established by such organizations as the Regional Accrediting Associations, the AAUP, the ALA and others.

In 1975, additional criteria were published in the Federal Register; both quantitative factors and qualitative factors were identified. The eight quantitative factors are illustrated in Table 5.

It should be noted that institutions falling "outside the range of one or more of the criteria will be given the opportunity to demonstrate that the shortfall or excess as the case may be does not materially alter the character of the institution" (Federal Register, p. 23,859).

Those institutions satisfying the quantitative criteria will be assessed using these qualitative measures:

> Those institutions which satisfy the requirements set out in Section 169.12 will be further assessed on the following qualitative factors which will be used to assess whether the institution meets the conditions set forth in Section 169.11(e). These factors will be evaluated over a three year period. Such period will include the academic year in which the institution is seeking recognition as a developing institution and the preceding two academic years.

Table 4
QUANTITATIVE MEASURES OF INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY (1971)

ITEM	TWO YEAR PRIVATE MINIMUM ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS	TWO YEAR PRIVATE DEVELOPING	TWO YEAR PRIVATE DEVELOPED	TWO YEAR PUBLIC MINIMUM ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS	TWO YEAR PUBLIC DEVELOPING	TWO YEAR PUBLIC DEVELOPED
FTE Student Enrollment	200	680	2,000	200	1,380	2,000
% Doctorates	--	--	--	--	--	--
% Masters	40%	70%	90%	40%	72%	90%
Average Professor's Salary	--	--	--	--	--	--
Average Instructor's Salary	$7,250	$6,410	$15,000	$8,000	$7,825	$20,000
Total Current Income	$145,000	$939,110	$3,712,000	$145,000	$1,379,000	$5,311,000
FTE/Student Expenditures	$675	$1,600	$2,268	$675	$1,190	$2,068
Total Volumes in Library	17,000	16,270	30,000	17,000	21,200	30,000

ITEM	FOUR YEAR PRIVATE MINIMUM ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS	FOUR YEAR PRIVATE DEVELOPING	FOUR YEAR PRIVATE DEVELOPED	FOUR YEAR PUBLIC MINIMUM ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS	FOUR YEAR PUBLIC DEVELOPING	FOUR YEAR PUBLIC DEVELOPED
FTE Student Enrollment	200	970	1,000	200	2,270	5,000
% Doctorates	30%	24%	70%	30%	23%	65%
% Masters	50%	63%	25%	50%	67%	24%
Average Professor's Salary	$7,970	$10,930	$22,680	$9,260	$12,000	$28,400
Average Instructor's Salary	$5,180	$6,520	$8,760	$5,340	$7,000	$9,500
Total Current Income	$270,000	$2,154,000	$5,941,268	$270,000	$3,707,800	$11,825,000
FTE/Student Expenditures	$850	$2,240	$2,800	$850	$1,790	$2,300
Total Volumes in Library	50,000	56,870	300,000	50,000	74,850	300,000

Table 5

Title III
Eligibility Criteria

Percentiles for FY '74 Grantees (AIDP and BIDP)
Using Data from '74 Applications

	5%	25%	50%	75%	95%
2-Year Public					
FTE Enrollment	395	766	1,217	2,304	4,122
Full-Time Enrollment	275	672	890	1,609	3,045
% of Faculty with Masters	40	70	79	83	91
Average Faculty Salary	7,800	8,822	10,113	11,041	14,800
% of Students from Low-Income Families[1]	14	33	47	63	86
Total E & G Expenditures	681,212	1,118,202	1,542,652	2,488,819	6,790,000
E & G Expenditures/FTE	621	1,066	1,341	1,680	2,300
Volumes in Library	10,750	20,913	27,505	34,179	47,000
2-Year Private					
FTE Enrollment	147	205	419	592	1,204
Full-Time Enrollment	123	178	384	546	1,196
% of Faculty with Masters	60	67	74	81	86
Average Faculty Salary	6,225	7,100	7,886	8,424	9,432
% of Students from Low-Income Families[1]	17	23	38	80	94
Total E & G Expenditures	315,562	379,777	672,865	990,788	1,407,697
E & G Expenditures/FTE	555	973	1,462	2,144	4,001
Volumes in Library	5,510	18,893	21,179	29,239	40,418
4-Year Public					
FTE Enrollment	672	1,702	2,372	3,224	5,290
% of Faculty w/PhD	20	28	32	38	95
Average Salary/Professor	11,460	14,040	15,467	16,315	17,888
Average Salary/Instructor	8,000	8,696	8,905	9,485	10,840
% of Students from Low-Income Families[1]	15	42	63	79	52
Total E & G Expenditures	988,633	2,916,696	3,917,770	5,395,140	10,280,000
E & G Expenditures/FTE	1,101	1,617	1,863	2,402	3,183
Volumes in Library	45,000	75,233	95,000	120,430	242,191
4-Year Private					
FTE Enrollment	346	532	704	1,027	1,865
% of Faculty w/PhD	12	24	31	40	49
Average Salary/Professor	9,750	12,000	12,854	13,802	15,840
Average Salary/Instructor	6,883	7,650	8,330	8,871	9,470
% of Students from Low-Income Families[1]	10	24	44	77	94
Total E & G Expenditures	801,890	1,108,871	1,590,827	2,140,888	3,987,714
E & G Expenditures/FTE	1,040	1,820	2,186	2,590	3,746
Volumes in Library	27,500	48,000	57,530	69,000	96,768

[1]For purposes of this subpart a low-income family is one whose adjusted family income is less than $7,500. (20 U.S.C. 1052)

Source: Federal Register, Vol. 40, No. 107--Tuesday, June 3, 1975, p. 23859.

(a)(1) Enrollment. Consideration will be given to the institution's full-time equivalent enrollment, the number of its graduates continuing their education either at a four-year institution in the case of a junior or community college, or at a graduate or professional school, the class standing of entering freshmen in their high school graduating class, the percentage of freshman graduating from the institution. If such enrollment data are in a decline over the three year period, the institution must demonstrate that such a decline is not inconsistent with continued institutional viability.

(2) In evaluating an institution pursuant to the criteria discussed in paragraph (a)(1) of this section, the Commissioner will take into consideration whether the institution has adopted an open enrollment admissions policy. As used in this section an open enrollment admissions policy of an institution of higher education means that the institution will admit as regular students all students who apply to that school for admission who have a certificate of graduation from a school proving secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate.

(b) Institution personnel. An institution will be evaluated with regard to the quality of its personnel in the areas of institutional administration including financial operations, student services, teaching and research,. Factors considered in making such an evaluation will include the percentage of professional personnel with advanced degrees and the salary scale of the institution.

(c) Institution vitality. An institution will be evaluated with regard to the quality of its personnel in the areas of institutional administration including financial operations, student services, teaching and research. Factors considered in making such a determination will include its fund raising capability, whether the institution has a planning capability and whether the institution has devised an institutional development plan.

(Federal Register, p.23,859)

The Advisory Council published annual reports in 1974 and 1975. These reports summarize the activities of the Council and the program during the previous year. The 1975 report contained proposed criteria changes which were to be incorporated into the Regulations for fiscal year 1976. These are summarized in Table 6. The range presented in that material represented the most specific attempt made to define quan-

TABLE 6

Criteria Adopted for Fiscal 1976 (Academic year 1976-77)

	At least-	Not more than-
2-year private institutions:		
1. Full-time equivalent enrollment	200	4,650
2. Full-time enrollment	160	4,325
3. Percent of faculty with masters	50	94
4. Average faculty salary	$6,225	$14,000
5. Percent of students from low-income families[1]	16	100
6. Total expenditures for educational and general purposes	$350,000	$8,500,000
7. Total educational and general expenditures per FTE student	$500	$6,500
8. Total volumes in library	3,500	40,000
2-year public institutions:		
1. Full-time equivalent enrollment	300	10,100
2. Full-time enrollment	240	7,475
3. Percent of faculty with masters	30	95
4. Average faculty salary	$7,600	$15,500
5. Percent of students from low-income families[1]	10	100
6. Total expenditures for educational and general purposes	$500,000	$13,000,000
7. Total educational and general expenditures per FTE student	$500	$4,600
8. Total volumes in library	6,000	71,000
4-year private institutions:		
1. Full-time equivalent enrollment	300	5,960
2. Percent of faculty with Doctorates	10	60
3. Average professor's salary	$8,750	$18,215
4. Average instructor's salary	$7,000	$13,100
5. Percent of students from low-income families[1]	10	100
6. Total expenditures for educational and general purposes	$600,000	$15,120,000
7. Total educational and general expenditures per FTE student	$900	$4,860
8. Total volumes in library	9,000	337,120
4-year public institution		
1. Full-time equivalent enrollment	600	7,200
2. Percent of faculty with Doctorates	20	82
3. Average professor's salary	$10,900	$20,600
4. Average instructor's salary	$7,300	$14,000
5. Percent of students from low-income families[1]	20	100
6. Total expenditures for educational and general purposes	$1,600,000	$16,000,000
7. Total educational and general expenditures per FTE student	$900	$4,985
8. Total volumes in library	10,000	317,580

1) For purposes of this subpart a low-income family is one whose adjusted family income is less than $7,500.

(Source: Advisory Council on Developing Institutions, Annual Report, 1975, p. 58)

titatively a developing institution.

These guidelines and modifications represent the most specific effort by the Office of Education since the inception of the program to articulate eligibility and selection criteria. Although there were and are limitations to the effectiveness of these--and it is unclear how or if these factors are used to assess quality rather than change--they represent a significant attempt to (a) separate the quantitative and qualitative, and (b) provide an index to demonstrate to applicants their position vis a vis other developing institutions.

The criteria described and illustrated above indicate a continuing effort by the Federal government to make explicit the criteria for evaluating and electing Title III recipient institutions. During the decade of funding the criteria have become more specific. In addition, there have been three substantive changes from the procedures and policies implemented initially.

1. The Development of the Advanced Institutional Development Program.

This program begun during the year 1973 provides multi-year funding for institutions which have moved beyond the Basic Program. Institutions eligible for the Advanced Program are those which seem to be strongest in relation to their peers; they recieve larger grants.

2. The Differentiation Between Types of Cooperation

The first of these is a bilateral arrangement between the developing institution and another institution or agency; the second is a consortium arrangement between at least three developing institutions

and agencies).

3. The Differentiation between Qualitative and Quantitative Criteria

The eligibility and selection process requires both qualitative and quantitative evaluation. The quantitative view seems to stress organizational complexity, potential for growth, and financial resources, while the qualitative view apparently emphasizes institutional commitment, energy and potential.

The Comptroller General recently authorized a study to assess the effectiveness of Title III funds. The Report to the Congress was published in 1975 and concluded "that the Office of Education needs to fine more clearly the term 'developing institution' and the purpose and thrust ofthe program..." It made the following recommendations:

> That the Secretary of HEW should direct the Commissioner of Education to:
>
> 1. Reconsider the criteria that OE established to identify developing institutions to insure that such criteria in fact identifies those institutions intended by the legislation.
>
> 2. Depending upon the results of the above, either insure that the criteria are consistently applied or appropriately modified.
>
> 3. Re-emphasize the need for participating institutions to state project goals in specific measurable terms, and relate the impact of the Title III efforts to institutional growth.

4. Consider how well institutions have complied with program Regulations for planning and evaluation when making decisions to award grants.

5. Use the program elibility criteria as a means for evaluating overall program impact.

6. Provide grantee institutions with timely award notifications to permit adequate planning and implementation of Title III activities.

7. Improve program monitoring by developing and implementing a more viable site visitation program.

The GAO report also provided a summary of the funding for Title III from fiscal year 1966 through fiscal year 1975. That material is included in Table 7.

The GAO report also included characteristics which had a statistically significant impact on eligibility and funding; that material is included in Table 8.

In the years since the passage of title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, more than $500 million has been appropriated for direct aid to eligible institutions. At present, with an annual appropriation of $110 million, Title III comprises the largest program of direct institutional aid for post-secondary education within the federal budget. Since it was first proposed, questions related to eligibility criteria have been raised by program applicants and administrators, and efforts have been made to modify and improve criteria in order to more easily achieve the intended goals of the legislation.

This paper is an attempt to examine the evolution of the criteria and to elucidate their meaning and intention as they were presented and articulated. Questions relating to criteria for elibility and selec-

Table 7

Year	Amount Requested by Institutions	Appropriations	Applications received (note a)	Applications approved (note b)
	(thousands)			
1966	$ 32,250	$ 5,000	536	158
1967	56,800	30,000	538	466
1968	113,900	30,000	500	368
1969	95,200	30,000	643	415
1970	85,400	30,000	646	442
1971	105,050	33,850	723	505
1972	143,000	51,850	787	556
1973 (note c)	220,000	87,350	924	475
1974 (note c)	598,000	99,992	905	390
Total	$1,449,600	$398,042		

[a]Includes institutions applying as direct grantees plus those applying under a cooperative arrangement.

[b]Includes institutions that were direct grantees plus those that benefited indirectly through participation in cooperative arrangements.

[c]Includes data for both the basic and advanced programs.

(U.S. Comptroller General, Report to the Congress: Assessing the Federal Program for Strengthening Developing Institutions of Higher Education. General Accounting Office Pubn. MWD-76-1, 1975.)

Table 8

Characteristics Having a Statistically Significant Impact on Eligibility and Funding* (1973-74)

Grant award determinations

2-year institutions

-whether or not the institution was funded in the previous school year, 1972-73; specifically, institutions funded in 1972-73 were strongly associated with the group selected to participate in 1973-74.

-the racial composition of the institution's student body; specifically, predominantly black institutions were strongly associated with the group selected to participate in 1973-74.

4-year institutions

-whether or not the institution was funded in the previous year; specifically, institutions funded in 1972-73 were strongly associated with the group selected to participate in 1973-74.

-the portion of the student body from low-income families; specifically, institutions selected to participate tended to have higher percentages of students from low-income families than those not selected.

-whether the institution was public of private institution; specifically, private institutions were strongly associated with the group selected to participate in 1973-74.

Fund allocation decisions

2-year institutions

-the funding relationship between OE and the participating institutions receiving grants directly from OE (as opposed to participating in a cooperative arrangement) were strongly associated with larger allocations.

-the racial composition of the institution's student body; predominantly black instituions were strongly associated with larger fund allocations.

-total education and general expenditures per full-time equivalent student; institutions which had higher total education and general expenditures per full-time equivalent student were strongly associated with larger fund allocations.

4-year institutions

-racial composition of the institution's student body; predominantly black institutions were strongly associated with larger fund allocations.

-the funding relationship between OE and the participating institution; institutions receiving grants directly from OE were strongly associated with larger fund allocations.

-number of students from low-income families; institutions with more students from low-income families tended to receive larger fund allocations.

(Source: Report to the Congress by the Comptroller General, pp. 9-10).

* listed in order of significance beginning with those having the greatest significance.

tion are enormously important today because the actual number of developing institutions is greater today than it was at the program's inception. A recent report of the Advisory Council noted that:

> It has been estimated by the Office of Education that the number of schools that fall within the 'developing' category approaches 1000. This means that about one third of our 2700 higher education institutions are in varying degrees of development, some of which are not even accredited. In fact, evidence shows that ten percent of our colleges and universities have not met the minimum standards of academic quality required for accreditation. These developing institutions include almost 550 two-year colleges and some 350 four-year colleges with predominantly white enrollments, and over 100 predominantly black colleges.
>
> (Advisory Council 1975, p.12).

This material has relevance for those who will seek assistance through Title III as well as for those who must administer it, and those who must develop its levislation and authorize its appropriations.

Bibliography

Advisory Council on Developing Institutions. Annual Report. Strengthening Developing Institutions: Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1974.

Advisory Council on Developing Institutions. Annual Report. Strengthening Developing Institutions: Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1975.

Bell, T. H. U. S. Commissioner of Education. "Strengthening Developing Institutions Program." Federal Register, vol. 40, No. 107 June 3, 1975, 23858-23863.

U. S. Comptroller General. Report to the Congress: Assessing the Federal Program for Strengthening Developing Institutions of Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: General Accounting Office Pubn. MWD-76-1, 1975.

U. S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Educational Goals for 1965. H. Rept. 88th Cong., 1st sess., 1965.

U. S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Higher Education Act of 1965. Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, on H. R. 3220, 89th Cong., 1st sess., 1965.

U. S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Higher Education Act of 1965. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Senate, on S. 600, 89th Cong. 1st sess., 1965.

U. S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Higher Education Amendments of 1967. Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives on H.R. 6232, 90th Cong., 1st sess., 1967.

U. S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Higher Education Amendments of 1968. Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, on H. R. 15067, 90th Cong., 2nd sess., 1968.

U. S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Educational Legislation, 1968. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Senate, on S. 3098 and S. 3099, 90th Cong., 2nd sess., 1968.

U. S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Higher Education Amendments of 1971. Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, on H. R. 32, H. R. 5191, H. R. 5192, H. R. 5193, and H. R. 7248, 92nd Cong., 1st sess., 1971.

U. S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Educational Amendments of 1971. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Senate, on S. 659, 92nd Cong., 1st sess., 1971.

U. S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Higher Education Act of 1965. H. Rept. 621 to accompany H. R. 9567. 89th Cong., 1st sess., 1965.

U. S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Higher Education Act of 1965. S. Rept. 673 to accompany H. R. 9567. 89th Cong., 1st sess., 1965.

U. S. Congress. House. Higher Education Act of 1965. Conference Report 1178 to accompany H. R. 9567. 89th Cong., 1st sess., 1965.

U. S. Code -- Congressional and Administrative News. 89th Cong., 1st sess., 1965., vol. 2.

Congressional Quarterly Almanac. 89th Cong., 1st sess., 1965. vol. XXI.

Bowles, Frank and DeCosta, Frank A. Between Two Worlds: A Profile of Negro Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. From Isolation to Mainstream: Problems of the Colleges Founded for Negroes. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Criteria for Identifying a Developing Institution. Prepared by: Division of College Support. Willa B. Player, Director, 1971.

Hodkinson, Harold L. and Schenkel, Walter. A Study of Title III of the Higher Education Act: The Developing Institutions Program. A study supported by the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation of the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley. Contract Number OEC-0-70-4927.

Howard, Lawrence C. The Developing Colleges Program: A Study of Title III Higher Education Act of 1965. Milwaukee: Institute of Human Relations, The University of Wisconsin, 1967. A study performed under contract No. OE5-10-325, Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

McGrath, Earl James. "The Negro in Higher Education: The Predominantly Negro Colleges and Universities in Transition." Expanding Opportunities, a journal of the Committee on Equality of Educational Opportunity of the American Council on Education, vol. II, No. 4 (May, 1965).

McGrath, Earl James. The Predominantly Negro Colleges and Universities in Transition. New York: Published for the Institute of Higher Education by the Bureau of Publications, Teacher's College, Columbia University, 1965.

Miller, James L., Jr., Gurin, Gerald, and Clarke, Mary Jo. Use and Effectiveness of Title III in Selected "Developing Institutions." A study supported by the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Research, 1970. Contract No. 0-8-080431-2999 (010).